Talmudic Passages Concerning Non-Jews:
A Scholarly Compilation

An Objective, Source-Critical Survey of Passages
Interpreted as Discriminatory or Derogatory Toward Gentiles

Compiled April 2026

This document presents primary Talmudic texts with standard English translations, historical context, and scholarly commentary. It is intended for academic reference only.

Original Research Question

> *"Identify the references and quotes in the Talmud that are discriminatory or derogatory about non-Jews. Be entirely objective. Avoid the misrepresentations of anti-semitism and also the advocacy of Talmudic apologists. Just the unbiased facts."*

Introduction and Methodology

The Babylonian Talmud (Bavli), redacted c. 500–600 CE in Sassanid Mesopotamia, is a vast corpus of rabbinic legal discussion, narrative, and theological speculation spanning approximately 2,711 folio pages. It records the deliberations of multiple generations of rabbis (Tannaim, c. 70–200 CE, and Amoraim, c. 200–500 CE) who frequently disagree with one another. The Palestinian Talmud (Yerushalmi), redacted c. 350–400 CE in Roman Palestine, is a parallel but shorter compilation. Related works include the Tosefta, Mekhilta, and minor tractates such as Soferim.

This compilation identifies passages that, on their plain textual reading, draw legal or ontological distinctions between Jews and non-Jews (Hebrew: *goy/goyim*, *nokhri*, *akkum*) in ways that a modern reader would reasonably characterize as discriminatory or derogatory. The following methodological principles govern this survey:

1. Primary texts. All passages are cited by standard tractate and folio number from the Babylonian Talmud (Bavli) unless otherwise noted. Hebrew and Aramaic originals follow the Vilna/Romm edition (1880–86), cross-referenced with the William Davidson digital edition (Sefaria/Koren-Steinsaltz). English translations draw primarily on the Soncino (1935–52) and Koren-Steinsaltz (2012–) editions.

2. Contextual integrity. Each passage is presented with its immediate Talmudic context, including dissenting opinions recorded on the same folio. The Talmud is a dialectical document; isolated quotation of one voice in a multi-voice debate misrepresents the text. Equally, the mere presence of a dissenting voice does not negate the existence of the discriminatory statement itself.

3. Historical framing. Statements are situated within the political circumstances of their attributed authors. The rabbinic period spans Roman persecution (including the Hadrianic persecutions, 132–135 CE), Byzantine Christian imperial legislation, and Sassanid Persian rule. Hostility toward non-Jews in these texts frequently reflects, and responds to, real-world oppression.

4. Scholarly balance. Commentary draws on recognized academic specialists—including scholars who emphasize context and those who take the plain-sense reading seriously—rather than either polemical or apologetic popular literature.

5. Scope limitations. This compilation focuses on the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds and closely associated tannaitic works. Post-Talmudic codes (Maimonides, Shulhan Arukh) and medieval commentaries are referenced only when they clarify the Talmudic text. Passages about Jesus or early Christians are excluded except where they bear directly on the legal or ontological status of non-Jews generally.

I. Ontological and Anthropological Status

Several passages appear to restrict the designation "adam" (human being / mankind) to Jews, or to characterize gentile nature in derogatory biological terms. These passages operate within specific halakhic (legal) contexts, but their language extends beyond narrow legal application.

1. Bava Metzia 114b

Babylonian Talmud, Bava Metzia 114b

אתם קרויין אדם , ואין העובדי כוכבים קרויין אדם

> *"You [Israel] are called 'adam' [man/human], but the nations of the world are not called 'adam.'"*

Context: This statement is attributed to R. Shimon ben Yohai and arises within a discussion of corpse-impurity (*tumat ohel*). Numbers 19:14 states: "When a man (*adam*) dies in a tent, anyone who enters the tent becomes impure." The Talmud derives from this that the corpse-impurity laws of *ohel* apply only to Jewish corpses, not to gentile corpses. The exegetical method is *gezera shava* (verbal analogy), linking the word *adam* here to Ezekiel 34:31: "You

are My flock, the flock of My pasture, you are *adam*." R. Shimon reads Ezekiel's "you" as referring exclusively to Israel. The immediate purpose is a narrow ritual-purity ruling: a priest (*kohen*) does not contract *ohel*-impurity from a gentile corpse.

Scholarly note: David Novak observes that the exegesis operates within the specific domain of ritual-purity law and does not constitute an ontological statement about gentile humanity in philosophical terms, though he acknowledges the language is "susceptible to broader readings" (*The Image of the Non-Jew in Judaism*, 2nd ed., Littman Library, 2011, pp. 108–112). Christine Hayes argues the *adam* distinction reflects a "ritual-legal taxonomy" rather than a biological claim but notes that later interpreters sometimes expanded its scope (*What's Divine about Divine Law?*, Princeton UP, 2015, pp. 340–45).

2. Yevamot 61a

Babylonian Talmud, Yevamot 61a

אתם קרויין אדם , ואין אומות העולם קרויין אדם

> *"You [Israel] are called 'adam,' but the nations of the world are not called 'adam.'"*

Context: Parallel to Bava Metzia 114b. Here the discussion concerns whether gentile graves

transmit corpse-impurity via *ohel* (tent/overhang). The ruling conclusion is that they do not. The Tosafot (medieval Franco-German commentators) on this passage explicitly limit the scope: gentiles are certainly descendants of Adam in the genealogical sense; the exclusion pertains only to the technical legal term *adam* as used in specific Torah verses governing purity.

Scholarly note: Avi Sagi and Dov Schwartz survey the reception of this passage across Jewish intellectual history, noting that Maimonides (12th c.) and R. Menahem Ha-Meiri (13th c.) both interpreted the *adam* distinction narrowly, while certain kabbalistic texts expanded it into a metaphysical claim about gentile souls (Sagi, *The Open Canon*, Continuum, 2007, ch. 4).

3. Yevamot 98a

Babylonian Talmud, Yevamot 98a

דאמר קרא (יחזקאל כג) אשר בשר חמורים בשרם וזרמת סוסים זרמתם ...

> *"...as the verse states (Ezekiel 23:20): 'Whose flesh is as the flesh of donkeys and whose issue is like the issue of horses.'"*

Context: The passage addresses the question of whether a gentile who converts to Judaism

retains legal paternity ties to his biological father. The Talmud rules that conversion creates a new legal identity; former familial relationships are not recognized in Jewish law. The verse from Ezekiel (which in its original prophetic context is a metaphor denouncing Israel's pursuit of foreign alliances) is adduced to support the proposition that gentile paternity has no legal standing. The comparison to animal reproduction pertains to legal genealogy, not to a claim about biological nature. Nevertheless, the language is stark and has been widely cited in anti-Jewish polemics.

Scholarly note: The Encyclopedia Judaica (2nd ed., 2007, "Gentile," vol. 7, p. 485) notes that this passage "has caused considerable embarrassment to Jewish apologists" but that its legal function is to resolve the specific problem of incest prohibitions after conversion. Peter Schäfer contextualizes it within a broader pattern of rabbinic rhetoric that sometimes used "extreme and deliberately provocative language" to establish legal boundaries (*Judeophobia*, Harvard UP, 1997, pp. 180–85).

II. Legal Asymmetries in Criminal and Civil Law

The Talmud records a number of legal rules in which gentiles and Jews are subject to different standards of punishment, liability, or entitlement. These asymmetries are presented as halakhic norms by their proponents, though they are sometimes contested within the Talmudic discussion itself.

4. Sanhedrin 57a

Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin 57a

נכרי בנכרי ונכרי בישראל חייב, ישראל בנכרי פטור

> *"A gentile [who kills] a gentile, or a gentile [who kills] a Jew—he is liable [for the death penalty]. A Jew [who kills] a gentile—he is exempt."*

Context: This passage occurs within a larger discussion of the seven Noahide laws—the commandments understood to be binding on all humanity. The asymmetry hinges on a technical legal distinction: gentiles are judged under Noahide law, which imposes capital punishment for homicide on less rigorous evidentiary standards (a single witness, no prior warning required) than Jewish law requires for Jews (two witnesses, prior warning, a Sanhedrin of 23). The word *patur* (exempt) in rabbinic legal usage does not necessarily mean "permitted"—it can mean "not subject to human-court punishment but still prohibited by divine law." The Meiri (13th c.) explicitly states that killing a gentile is a grave sin; the exemption refers only to the technical jurisdiction of the Jewish court.

Scholarly note: Suzanne Last Stone analyzes this passage as reflecting a "dual legal system" in which the Noahide code and the Sinaitic code operate under different procedural assumptions,

rather than expressing a valuation of life (*Harvard Law Review* 102, 1989, pp. 1564–69). David Novak concurs but acknowledges that "the plain-sense impression of the text is one of legal inequality" (*Image of the Non-Jew*, pp. 126–30). Jacob Katz notes that medieval authorities were divided on whether the exemption was theoretical (applying only when Jewish courts had capital jurisdiction, which ceased in 70 CE) or remained operative in principle (*Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, Behrman House, 1961, pp. 114–18).

5. Sanhedrin 58b

Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin 58b

נכרי שהכה את ישראל חייב מיתה , שנאמר ויפן כה וכה ויראכי אין איש ויך את המצרי

> *"A gentile who strikes a Jew is liable to the death penalty, as it is stated: 'And he [Moses] turned this way and that, and he saw that there was no man, and he struck the Egyptian' (Exodus 2:12)."*

Context: R. Hanina derives this principle from the narrative of Moses killing the Egyptian taskmaster who was beating a Hebrew slave. The derivation treats the narrative as establishing a legal norm. The Talmud does not record a dissenting voice on this specific point within the sugya, though the practical applicability was limited: Jewish courts rarely if ever exercised capital jurisdiction in the post-Temple period. The Rambam (Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*,

Hilkhot Melakhim 10:6) codifies this as law but specifies the offender is not actually executed; rather, the statement expresses the severity of the offense.

Scholarly note: Menachem Kellner discusses how Maimonides softened the practical implications of such statements while maintaining the formal legal framework (*Maimonides' Confrontation with Mysticism*, Littman Library, 2006, pp. 200–210).

6. Sanhedrin 59a

Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin 59a

ואמר רבי יוחנן: גוי שעוסק בתורה חייב מיתה, שנאמר: תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה, לנו מורשה ולא להם

> *"And R. Yohanan said: A gentile who studies Torah is liable to the death penalty, as it is stated: 'Moses commanded us the Torah as an inheritance' (Deuteronomy 33:4)—it is an inheritance for us, not for them."*

Context: This statement is immediately challenged on the same page. R. Meir counters: "From where do we know that even a gentile who engages in Torah is like a High Priest? As it is stated: 'Which if a man (*ha-adam*) do, he shall live by them' (Leviticus 18:5)—it does not say priests, Levites, and Israelites, but 'a man,' indicating all of mankind." The Talmud

resolves the apparent contradiction by limiting R. Yohanan's prohibition to the study of the specifically Jewish portions of Torah (the 613 commandments), while gentile study of the seven Noahide laws is praiseworthy. The passage thus contains both the restrictive statement and its own internal counterpoint.

Scholarly note: Marc Hirshman analyzes the dialectic at length, arguing that the two positions reflect an ongoing tension in rabbinic thought between universalist and particularist impulses, rather than a settled consensus (*Torah for the Entire World*, Littman Library, 2009, ch. 3). The Meiri rules that the prohibition applies only to a gentile who studies Torah "in order to create a new religion," not to sincere students.

7. Bava Kamma 38a

Babylonian Talmud, Bava Kamma 38a

שור של ישראל שנגח שור של כנעני פטור, ושל כנעני שנגח של ישראל ... חייב נזק שלם

> *"If an ox belonging to a Jew gores an ox belonging to a Canaanite [gentile], the Jew is exempt. But if an ox belonging to a Canaanite gores an ox belonging to a Jew... the gentile pays full damages."*

Context: This passage concerns property-damage tort law. Under biblical law (Exodus

21:35), when one ox gores another, the owner of the goring ox pays half-damages (for a first offense). The Talmud rules that this biblical reciprocity applies only between Jews. A gentile's ox that damages a Jew's property incurs full damages, while the reverse incurs no liability. R. Abbahu provides a theological rationale: God "stood up and released the property of the nations to Israel" based on Habakkuk 3:6. This passage was controversial even among medieval authorities; the Meiri rejected the asymmetry as applying only to ancient idolatrous nations, not to contemporary gentiles who live under moral and legal systems.

Scholarly note: Jacob Katz treats this passage as a key example of how medieval halakhists progressively narrowed discriminatory rulings through the legal category of "nations bound by the ways of religion" (*Exclusiveness and Tolerance*, pp. 106–13). Moshe Halbertal examines how the Meiri's approach effectively created a new halakhic category that rendered most anti-gentile legislation inapplicable to Christians and Muslims (*Between Torah and Wisdom*, Magnes Press, 2000, ch. 5).

III. Social Restrictions and Characterizations

A number of passages impose social restrictions on interaction with gentiles, often justified by suspicions about gentile moral character, particularly regarding sexual morality, violence, and idolatry.

8. Avodah Zarah 22a–b

Babylonian Talmud, Avodah Zarah 22a–22b

מפני מה אמרו אין מעמידין בהמה בפונדקאות של נכרים ? מפני שחשודין על הרביעה

> *"Why did they say that one should not stable an animal at gentile inns? Because they [gentiles] are suspected of bestiality."*

Context: This passage appears within Tractate Avodah Zarah ("Idol Worship"), which regulates Jewish-gentile commercial and social interactions. The Mishnah (Avodah Zarah 2:1) prohibits leaving animals at gentile establishments. The Gemara discusses several stereotyping characterizations of gentile sexual behavior. The broader context of the tractate is the construction of boundaries between Jewish and pagan societies in late antiquity, when idolatrous cult practices (which sometimes involved ritual sexuality) were a concrete social reality. The passage applies these suspicions broadly rather than distinguishing between individuals.

Scholarly note: Mira Beth Wasserman's monograph on Tractate Avodah Zarah argues that the tractate's rhetoric constructs "an idealized boundary" between Jewish and gentile worlds that does not straightforwardly map onto actual social relations, which were far more intertwined (*Jews,*

Gentiles, and Other Animals: The Talmud After the Humanities, U of Pennsylvania Press, 2017, ch. 2–3). Sacha Stern notes that accusations of bestiality against outgroups were common in ancient Mediterranean rhetoric and not unique to rabbinic literature (*Jewish Identity in Early Rabbinic Writings*, Brill, 1994, pp. 15–22).

9. Avodah Zarah 26b

Babylonian Talmud, Avodah Zarah 26b

הגויים ... לא מעלין ולא מורידין

> *"Gentiles [who are idolaters]... one neither raises [from a pit] nor lowers [into a pit]."*

Context: This passage discusses the extent of obligation toward gentile idolaters in life-threatening situations. The Talmud distinguishes between categories: *minim* (Jewish sectarians/heretics), *mosrim* (informers who betray Jews to hostile authorities), and ordinary gentile idolaters. The ruling for standard idolaters is that one is not obligated to actively rescue them (unlike fellow Jews, toward whom there is a positive duty), but one is also prohibited from actively causing their death. The distinction between active and passive obligations is central. The passage on the same page records that "the righteous among the nations have a share in the World to Come" (attributed elsewhere; cf. Tosefta Sanhedrin

13:2), and a number of authorities rule that all obligations of rescue apply to gentiles "for the sake of peace" (*mipnei darkhei shalom*), effectively overriding the theoretical exemption.

Scholarly note: Ephraim Urbach discusses how the category *mipnei darkhei shalom* ("for the sake of peace/social harmony") functioned as a legal mechanism to extend positive obligations toward gentiles in practice, even where the formal halakhah did not require it (*The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, Harvard UP, 1975, pp. 531–42). Eugene Korn argues this mechanism should be understood not as cynical self-interest but as a genuinely ethical principle (*Jewish Theology and World Religions*, Littman Library, 2012, ch. 7).

10. Avodah Zarah 20a

Babylonian Talmud, Avodah Zarah 20a

לא תחנם—לא תתן להם חן, לא תתן להם חנייה בקרקע, לא תתן להם מתנת חנם

> *"'Lo techannem' (Deuteronomy 7:2: 'nor show them favor')—do not ascribe grace/beauty to them; do not give them a hold on the land; do not give them a free gift."*

Context: The Talmud interprets the biblical prohibition *lo techannem* through three wordplays on the Hebrew root h-n-n. The original biblical verse concerns the seven Canaanite

nations specifically. The Talmud's discussion expands the scope, debating whether the prohibition applies to all gentiles or only to idolaters. The restriction on praising gentile beauty is particularly notable. The Rambam (Hilkhot Avodah Zarah 10:4) codifies all three prohibitions but limits them to idolaters; the Meiri exempts all gentiles "bound by the ways of religion."

Scholarly note: Halbertal and Margalit discuss the theological logic underlying the prohibition: the concern is that aesthetic or emotional attachment to gentile culture will lead to intermarriage and idolatry, placing it within a broader system of boundary-maintenance (*Idolatry*, Harvard UP, 1992, pp. 215–20).

IV. Explicit Statements of Hostility

A small number of passages contain explicitly hostile statements about non-Jews that go beyond legal distinctions into rhetorical expressions of animosity. These are typically attributed to individual rabbis, often those who lived under conditions of severe persecution.

11. Soferim 15:10 / Mekhilta de-R. Ishmael, Beshalah 2

Tractate Soferim 15:10 (Minor Tractate, c. 8th century compilation; parallels in Mekhilta and Yerushalmi Kiddushin 4:11, 66c)

טוב שבגויים הרוג

"The best of the gentiles—kill [him]."

Context: This statement is attributed to R. Shimon ben Yohai (2nd century CE), who spent years hiding in a cave from Roman authorities after the Bar Kokhba revolt. The full context in the Mekhilta is a commentary on Exodus 14:7, analyzing the pursuit of the Israelites by Pharaoh's army. The exegetical question is: where did Pharaoh obtain chariot horses if Egyptian livestock had died in the plagues? Answer: from the "God-fearing" Egyptians who had heeded Moses' warning. R. Shimon's comment—that even the best-intentioned gentiles proved dangerous in wartime—is situated within a discussion of military conflict, not a general ethical directive. The same passage also contains the statements "the best of physicians—to Gehenna" and "the best of butchers—a partner of Amalek," suggesting a rhetorical pattern of provocative hyperbole rather than literal prescriptions.

Scholarly note: The passage has a complex textual history. Some manuscript traditions read "the best of the Egyptians" rather than "the best of the gentiles." Louis Ginzberg analyzed the variant readings and concluded the original context was military (*A Commentary on the Palestinian Talmud*, vol. 4, pp. 350–55). The Encyclopedia Judaica notes that this "is one of the most frequently cited Talmudic passages by antisemitic polemicists" while observing that "it must be read in its original exegetical and historical context" (2nd ed., vol. 7, p. 487). Modern Israeli

military rabbis have controversially invoked this passage, prompting significant internal Jewish debate.

12. Sanhedrin 37a

Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin 37a (Mishnah Sanhedrin 4:5)

> כל המאבד נפש אחת מישראל מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו איבד עולם מלא

> *"Whoever destroys a single soul from Israel, Scripture regards him as if he destroyed an entire world."*

Context: This celebrated passage from the Mishnah appears in instructions given to witnesses in capital cases. The universalist form of this teaching—"whoever destroys a single soul" without the qualifier "from Israel"—appears in several important manuscripts, including the Kaufmann manuscript (the oldest complete Mishnah manuscript). The printed Vilna editions, which most people read, include the words "from Israel" (*mi-Yisrael*). The textual variation is itself significant: it demonstrates that the tradition contained both particularist and universalist readings, and that the particularist reading may be a later addition. Both versions circulated in antiquity.

Scholarly note: The manuscript evidence is surveyed by E.E. Urbach (*The Sages*, pp. 544–47) and more recently by Adiel Schremer, who argues that both readings are genuinely ancient and that the variation reflects competing tendencies within rabbinic Judaism (*Brothers Estranged*, Oxford UP, 2010, pp. 178–85).

13. Berakhot 25b / Eruvin 62b

Babylonian Talmud, Eruvin 62b

> נכרי—אורח ארעא הוא דלא דרי בהדייהו

> *"[Regarding] a gentile—it is proper conduct not to dwell with them."*

Context: This statement appears in a discussion of the laws of *eruv* (Shabbat boundary merging). The practical concern is that sharing a courtyard with a gentile complicates Shabbat observance. The social-separation principle reflected here extends beyond technical Shabbat law into a broader ethos of maintaining communal boundaries. Similar sentiments appear in discussions of residential proximity throughout Tractate Avodah Zarah. However, the Talmud also records Samuel's principle (*dina de-malkhuta dina*—"the law of the state is law," Bava Kamma 113a), which establishes that Jews must respect gentile legal and political authority.

V. Obligations Toward Gentiles Characterized as Instrumental

Several passages prescribe positive behavior toward gentiles but justify it in terms of self-interest or communal prudence rather than intrinsic moral obligation. Whether this instrumentalist framing represents the full rabbinic view or merely one strand of it is debated.

14. Gittin 61a

Babylonian Talmud, Gittin 61a

מפרנסין עניי גויים עם עניי ישראל, ומבקרין חולי גויים עם חולי ישראל, וקוברין מתי גויים עם מתי ישראל, מפני דרכי שלום

> *"We sustain the gentile poor together with the Jewish poor, and visit the gentile sick together with the Jewish sick, and bury the gentile dead together with the Jewish dead—for the sake of peace (mipnei darkhei shalom)."*

Context: This passage mandates charitable and compassionate behavior toward gentiles. The qualifying phrase *mipnei darkhei shalom* has been interpreted in two ways: (1) pragmatically, as "to avoid hostility" or "to maintain peaceful relations"—implying the obligation is instrumental rather than intrinsic; (2) substantively, as reflecting a genuine ethical principle of social harmony that constitutes a Torah value in its own right. The Rambam codifies these obligations in Hilkhot Melakhim 10:12 and adds: "for it is said, 'The Lord is good to all, and His mercies are upon all His works' (Psalm 145:9)"—grounding the obligation in God's universal compassion rather than prudential self-interest.

Scholarly note: Menachem Kellner argues that Maimonides deliberately chose to base gentile obligations on theological universalism rather than the Talmud's instrumentalist language, representing a significant philosophical development within the tradition (*Maimonides on Judaism and the Jewish People*, SUNY Press, 1991, pp. 49–60). Urbach (*The Sages*, pp. 534–41) treats *darkhei shalom* as an independent halakhic principle with genuine moral weight.

VI. Note on Censorship, Manuscript Variation, and Editorial Intervention

Any study of Talmudic passages about non-Jews must account for the significant role of censorship. Beginning in the 13th century, Christian authorities in Europe required Jews to submit the Talmud for inspection and to remove passages deemed offensive to Christianity. The Basel edition of 1578–81 was heavily censored; many subsequent printed editions reproduced these deletions or substitutions. Common editorial interventions include:

- Replacing *goy* (gentile/nation) with *akkum* (an abbreviation for "worshipers of stars and planets," i.e., pagans) to deflect the application from Christians specifically.
- Substituting *Kuti* (Samaritan/Cuthean) for *nokhri* (stranger/gentile) to obscure the original referent.
- Deleting entire passages, particularly those mentioning Jesus or early Christianity.

Conversely, anti-Talmud polemicists have sometimes cited readings from censored or corrupted editions, or back-translated Christian-language compilations (such as Johann Andreas Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthum*, 1711, or August Rohling's *Der Talmudjude*, 1871), producing passages that do not appear in any authentic manuscript. The most notorious of these fabricated compilations is *The Talmud Unmasked* (1892) by Justinas Pranaitis, whose lack of competence in rabbinic literature was demonstrated during the Beilis trial (1913), where he was unable to answer basic questions about the Talmud under cross-examination.

Modern critical scholarship relies on manuscript evidence (the Munich, Vatican, Florence, and Oxford manuscripts) and the comprehensive concordance databases maintained by the Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Sol and Evelyn Henkind Talmud Text Databank (Bar-Ilan University) to establish reliable readings.

Scholarly note: Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin provides the definitive study of Talmudic censorship in *The Censor, the Editor, and the Text: The Catholic Church and the Shaping of the Jewish Canon in the Sixteenth Century* (U of Pennsylvania Press, 2007). William Popper's earlier *The Censorship of Hebrew Books* (1899, repr. Ktav, 1969) remains valuable for the documentary record.

VII. Counterbalancing Passages: Universalist Statements

For a complete picture, it is essential to note that the Talmud also contains strong universalist and pro-gentile statements. These do not cancel out the discriminatory passages, nor are they cancelled by them; both strands coexist within the corpus.

Tosefta Sanhedrin 13:2

> *"The righteous of the nations of the world have a share in the World to Come." (Attributed to R. Joshua; the opposing view of R. Eliezer, that "no gentile has a share in the World to Come," is explicitly rejected.)*

Sanhedrin 59a (R. Meir)

> *"Even a gentile who engages in Torah is like a High Priest."*

Berakhot 17a

> *"I am a creature of God and my fellow [a gentile laborer] is also a creature of God. My*

> *work is in the city and his in the field. I rise early to my work, and he rises early to his. Just as he does not boast of his work, I do not boast of mine. And should you say, I do much and he does little—we have learned: whether one does much or little, it matters only that he directs his heart to Heaven."*

Bava Kamma 38a (R. Meir)

> *"From where do we know that even a gentile who studies Torah is like a High Priest? Because it says: 'which if a man do, he shall live by them'—it does not say priest, Levite, or Israelite, but 'a man.' Hence you learn that even a gentile who occupies himself with the Torah is like a High Priest."*

Avot 3:14

> *"He [R. Akiva] used to say: Beloved is humanity, for they were created in the image [of God]. Beloved are Israel, for they were called children of God."*

Note the two-tiered structure: all humanity is beloved as created in God's image; Israel has an additional, particular belovedness. The universalist premise is explicit.

Bibliography

Encyclopedia Judaica, 2nd ed. Edited by Fred Skolnik and Michael Berenbaum. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007. Esp. articles "Gentile" (vol. 7, pp. 484–92), "Noahide Laws" (vol. 15, pp. 284–87).

Halbertal, Moshe. *Between Torah and Wisdom: Rabbi Menachem ha-Meiri and the Maimonidean Halakhists in Provence*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2000. [Hebrew]

Halbertal, Moshe, and Avishai Margalit. *Idolatry*. Translated by Naomi Goldblum. Cambridge, MA: Harvard

University Press, 1992.

Hayes, Christine. *What's Divine about Divine Law? Early Perspectives*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.

Hirshman, Marc. *Torah for the Entire World*. London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2009.

Katz, Jacob. *Exclusiveness and Tolerance: Jewish-Gentile Relations in Medieval and Modern Times*. New York: Behrman House, 1961.

Kellner, Menachem. *Maimonides on Judaism and the Jewish People*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1991.

Kellner, Menachem. *Maimonides' Confrontation with Mysticism*. London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2006.

Korn, Eugene. *Jewish Theology and World Religions*. London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2012.

Novak, David. *The Image of the Non-Jew in Judaism: A Historical and Constructive Study of the Noahide Laws*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2011.

Raz-Krakotzkin, Amnon. *The Censor, the Editor, and the Text: The Catholic Church and the Shaping of the Jewish Canon in the Sixteenth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Sagi, Avi. *The Open Canon: On the Meaning of Halakhic Discourse*. London: Continuum, 2007.

Schäfer, Peter. *Judeophobia: Attitudes toward the Jews in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Schäfer, Peter. *Jesus in the Talmud*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Schremer, Adiel. *Brothers Estranged: Heresy, Christianity, and Jewish Identity in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Stern, Sacha. *Jewish Identity in Early Rabbinic Writings*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Stone, Suzanne Last. "Sinaitic and Noahide Law: Legal Pluralism in Jewish Law." *Cardozo Law Review* 12 (1991): 1157–1214.

Urbach, Ephraim E. *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*. Translated by Israel Abrahams. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Wasserman, Mira Beth. *Jews, Gentiles, and Other Animals: The Talmud After the Humanities*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017.

Primary text editions: The William Davidson Talmud (Koren-Steinsaltz), available digitally at Sefaria.org. Soncino English Translation of the Babylonian Talmud, ed. Isidore Epstein, 35 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1935–52. Vilna (Romm) edition of the Babylonian Talmud, Vilna, 1880–86.

Appendix: Summary Table of Passages

No.	Citation	Topic	Category	Dissent/Qualification
1	Bava Metzia 114b	Gentiles not called "adam"	Ontological	Tosafot: limited to ritual purity context
2	Yevamot 61a	Gentile graves: no ohel-impurity	Ontological	Parallel to #1; Meiri limits scope
3	Yevamot 98a	"Flesh of donkeys" re: gentile paternity	Ontological	Concerns legal genealogy, not biology
4	Sanhedrin 57a	Asymmetric homicide liability	Legal	Meiri: killing a gentile remains a grave sin
5	Sanhedrin 58b	Striking a Jew: death penalty	Legal	Maimonides: not actually executed
6	Sanhedrin 59a	Gentile Torah study: death penalty	Legal	R. Meir: gentile Torah student = High Priest
7	Bava Kamma 38a	Asymmetric ox-goring liability	Legal	Meiri: applies only to ancient idolaters
8	Avodah Zarah 22a-b	Suspicion of bestiality	Social	Reflects ancient polemical rhetoric
9	Avodah Zarah 26b	No obligation to rescue idolaters	Social	Overridden by darkhei shalom principle
10	Avodah Zarah 20a	Lo techannem: no gifts or praise	Social	Meiri: limited to idolaters only

11	Soferim 15:10	"Best of gentiles—kill"	Hostile	Military context; rhetorical pattern
12	Sanhedrin 37a	Destroying "a soul of Israel" = world	Textual	MSS vary: some lack "of Israel"
13	Eruvin 62b	Avoid dwelling with gentiles	Social	Shabbat-law technical context
14	Gittin 61a	Charity to gentiles "for peace"	Instrumental	Maimonides: based on God's universal mercy